Within the convent, the former duchess took up rigorous engagement with the *devotio moderna* and patronage of the Colettine Poor Clares at Pont-à-Mousson. Philippe positioned her actions as vigorous Catholicism against Protestantism, utilizing knowledge drawn from her secular life to help defend the Colettines against intrusive control by male clerics. Tranié situates Philippe within the tradition of noblewomen who retired to convents, but her longevity made her unusual. Her combination of high secular rank (aspirational queen of Sicily) and identification with low status (she called herself an "earthworm") facilitated Philippe's assimilation to the tradition of popular sainthood that prevailed in Lorraine. Drawing on the conventions of convent hagiographies, the *Vie de Philippe de Gueldre* (first edition 1585) situated Philippe as a would-be saint. Tranié's analysis of iterations of the *Vie* meticulously considers its creation, engagements with mysticism, efforts to counter Protestantism, and changing emphases with respect to personal sanctity and the ambitions of the house of Lorraine. Accounts of Philippe's sanctity straddle the conflicting imperatives of Catholic militancy and traditional feminine piety. Philippe's reputation variously served to counter concerns about sorcery in Lorraine, affirm the ducal family's orthodoxy, and provide an example of active feminine Catholicity. By the eighteenth century, commentators figured Philippe as a Catholic allegory of Lorraine. While Philippe was never formally canonized and her convent was dispersed during the Revolution, Tranié brilliantly demonstrates the importance of understanding not just the individual woman, but how feminine power was created through an ensemble of gender practices.

Katherine Crawford, *Vanderbilt University*
doi:10.1017/rqx.2021.253

Early Modern Histories of Time: The Periodizations of Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century England. Kristen Poole and Owen Williams, eds.
Folger Shakespeare Library. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2019. viii + 362 pp. $79.95.

A period piece; period dress; period charm: even popular speech marks the pastness of the past by talking in periods. "It's not my period," responds the historian, making clear how we partition the past by dividing it periodically. This habit of periodizing the past—of parceling it into periods and estranging it from the present by giving it a period flavor—began in the period formerly known as the Renaissance but now generally called early modern. That shift in both naming and framing shows that periodization has a history and that it is not just historians who have a stake in how we divide the various parts of the past.

Early Modern Histories of Time brings together a distinguished team of scholars to examine the period when periodization first became an urgent issue. In fifteen discrete

https://doi.org/10.1017/rqx.2021.254 Published online by Cambridge University Press

chapters, opened by a richly illuminating introduction by the editors, the volume ranges widely across contemporary and retrospective conceptions of periodization, mostly in the centuries between the Reformation and the Glorious Revolution (as historians would periodize it), or from Shakespeare to the Restoration (as literary scholars might prefer). Many contributors note that contemporaries construed periods in two contrasting, even incompatible, ways: as cyclical or circular, like the periods of the moon or menstrual periods, yet also as linear and time bound. They also generated novel temporalities such as the centuries invented by the Magdeburg Centuriators or the life cycles determined by English parish registrations of births and deaths after 1538. Even without our current battles over Renaissance versus early modern, or how to distinguish the parts of a literature curriculum, the period itself had plenty of competing ideas of periodization to inspire fertile reflection.

The most compelling essays in *Early Modern Histories of Time* set up conversations between past and present periodizations. For example, the two opening essays, by the historian Tim Harris and the literary scholar Nigel Smith, introduce their respective fields' approaches to periodization with acute historiographic surveys and well-chosen historical examples: an ideal dialogue to open a graduate, or even an undergraduate, seminar in either discipline. The Reformation and its redefinition of sacred and secular time naturally bulk large, with three chapters on "Religion," by Euan Cameron (on periodization in early modern church history, from Augustine to Luther, Caspar Peucer, and John Foxe, among others), Ethan Shagan (a luminous reflection on periodization and the secular, contra Charles Taylor), and James Simpson (making a masterly case for "trans-Reformation" literary history, crossing conventional boundaries of medieval and early modern).

The bulk of *Early Modern Histories of Time* comprises case studies, two in architectural history and social history focusing on the built environment of Shakespeare's Stratford-upon-Avon (by Kate Giles) and the periodicity of "laundry time" in sixteenth-century England (by Natasha Korda), and the rest in literary history. Among these, Gordon Teskey sets up a dazzling play of resonances among early modern English poets, while Julianne Werlin focuses on the "emotional periodization" (169) of Renaissance love poetry; Douglas Bruster and Julia Reinhard Lupton treat, respectively, "Shakespeare, Period" and "Periodic Shakespeare"; Steven Zwicker examines John Dryden's engagement with time after the Restoration, and Mihoko Suzuki offers "a Gramscian perspective" (246) on continuity across the alleged periodic watershed of 1660; and, in the concluding pair of chapters, Heather Dubrow argues suggestively that "periodization involves not only temporality but spatiality" (251), and volume editor Kristen Poole rounds off the collection with a time-hopping reflection on typology, from Origen to the popular biblical hermeneutics of the early seventeenth-century English author of Origenic "hexapla," Andrew Willet. The closing words of Poole's essay pose a key question that animates the collection as a whole: how may we, as

https://doi.org/10.1017/rqx.2021.254 Published online by Cambridge University Press

scholars, cultivate the idiomatic knowledge needed to understand our period "while enabling expansive intellectual inquiry beyond the box of a historical period?" (282).

"Always historicize!" Fredric Jameson famously urged. Less notoriously, he observed, "We cannot not periodize," as if preemptively answering Jacques Le Goff's more recent challenge in his *Faut-il vraiment découper l'histoire en tranches?* (Must we divide history into periods?, 2014). Such decoupage is now practically inevitable yet still perpetually unsettling to almost every sort of historian. *Early Modern Histories of Time* provides an indispensable survey of just how periodization became both inescapable and endlessly, fruitfully debatable. Period.

David Armitage, *Harvard University*
doi:10.1017/rqx.2021.254

Law in Common: Legal Cultures in Late-Medieval England. Tom Johnson. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2020. xiv + 324 pp. $99.

This is an ambitious book. Based on a wide survey of unpublished local court records—royal (leet, forest, admiralty), borough, manorial, and ecclesiastical—Johnson first creates a sense for local legal cultures in England, and then selects the common elements in those cultures to paint a picture of how ordinary people came to understand the law that they had in common. He begins with the Peasants' Revolt of 1388 and ends early in the reign of Henry VIII. The book is divided into two parts. The first four chapters seek to reconstruct the legal culture of the rural village, the urban area, the maritime world, and the forest. The next four chapters deal with "the legal landscape," law as embedded in nature; the "economy of legitimate knowledge," who was listened to in the courts and about what; the increase in using English to speak about the law; and the great increase in the use of written documents, legal but not necessarily connected with litigation. The conclusion argues that these phenomena made the law more popular and the *populus* more political.

To the legal historian this might seem like Hamlet without the Dane. The central royal courts of common law are hardly mentioned. The Chancery is mentioned a bit more often, normally as a recipient of petitions against the actions of local courts. Assizes, gaol delivery, coroners, and justices of the peace get a few mentions, but they are not emphasized. On the ecclesiastical side, episcopal consistory courts get some mention, but the emphasis is on ruridecanal courts and peculiars. The reader will know that the higher institutions existed, but the argument almost suggests that they were not particularly relevant to most ordinary people.

Even if we reject this implied suggestion, we can nonetheless appreciate the imagination of Johnson's approach. A central theme of much medieval English legal history is how the secular local courts were gradually brought into the common-law system. By

https://doi.org/10.1017/rqx.2021.254 Published online by Cambridge University Press